

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Felicia Lynum,)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:06-3579-MJP
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Federal Bureau of Investigation,)	
Sacramento California;)	
State of California;)	<u>ORDER APPROVING MAGISTRATE'S</u>
County of Sutter;)	<u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION)</u>
Yuba City, California;)	
Department of Veteran Affairs,)	
Palo Alto, California;)	
Federal Bureau of Investigation,)	
Columbia, South Carolina)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court for a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., and filed January 11, 2007. Plaintiff filed this matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that she has been deprived of property, restricted in her ability to travel, denied a driver's license, denied medical treatment, as well as several other allegations. It appears that the Plaintiff has failed to name proper parties to her suit, or, in the alternative, she has failed to state a claim for which relief could be granted against those entities who might be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The magistrate recommends dismissing Plaintiff's case without prejudice and without issuance of service.

This action has been brought by the Plaintiff *pro se*. This Court is required to construe such *pro se* pleadings liberally to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d. 652 (1972). *Pro se* pleadings are held to a lower standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court.

Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also “receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions.” *Id.* In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th Cir. 1983). No objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed.

After reviewing the entirety of this case, including the Report and Recommendation, this Court approves the recommendation of the magistrate. This action is hereby **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance of service of process.

s/Matthew J. Perry
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina

February 8, 2007